

At this point in the text, something very peculiar happens. The poet suddenly announces another method for computing the Ascendant, and what he proceeds to expound (483–509) is exactly the same vulgar method which he had previously described and condemned. The only difference is that, while he had said earlier (218–24) that the vulgar method consisted of counting 2 hours of rising time per sign, he now says one multiplies the sundial time by 15 in order to get the number of degrees rising. The wording may be different, but the substance is the same. Commentators (Bouché-Leclercq, Housman, Goold) think Manilius blundered. While it is true that he often did (as, e.g., when he put Orion in Aries 10°, *Astr.* 5. 57–66), the care with which this whole question of the Ascendant is treated rules out any mistake due to carelessness or inattention. The possibility that he did not understand much of the problem involved is also precluded by our previous analysis. It therefore seems logical to venture the hypothesis that the passage from 483 to 509 is spurious.⁷

APPENDIX: COORDINATES OF THE SUN AND COMPUTATION OF THE ASCENDANT

Data: maximum number of hours of daylight = $M = 15$ hours; longitude of the sun = $L = 30^\circ$ (the latitude is taken as 0°); sundial time = $SDT = 7:30$ hours; obliquity of ecliptic = $e = 23.7^\circ$ (i.e., at the time of Manilius). *Coordinates of the sun:* geographical latitude of Rome = $\phi = 41.08^\circ$ (from: $\tan \phi = -\cos [(M \times 15) \div 2] / \tan e$); right ascension of the sun = $\alpha = 27.864^\circ$ (from: $\tan \alpha = \tan L \cos e$); declination of the sun = $\delta = 11.594^\circ$ (from: $\sin \delta = \sin L \sin e$); hour angle of the sun = $h = 100.303^\circ$ (from: $\cos h = -\tan \delta \tan \phi$). *Local sidereal time:* local sidereal time = $LST = 52.940^\circ$ (i.e., 3:32 hours) (from: $LST = [hSDT/6] - h + \alpha$). *Ascendant:* Ascendant = $ASC = 151^\circ = \text{Virgo } 1^\circ$ (from: $\tan ASC = -\cos LST / [\sin e \tan \phi + \cos e \sin LST]$).

PIERRE BRIND'AMOUR
University of Ottawa

7. The *Astronomica* as it has come down to us in the manuscripts is full of apocryphal verses which modern editors have had to bracket. There are 45 of them in the recent edition by G. P. Goold. There are also numerous gaps in the text, as well as inverted and dispersed passages. So, an addition of the kind and length suggested here is not improbable.

ON A CITATION OF JULIUS ROMANUS IN CHARISIUS

The text of Charisius *Ars grammatica* 1. 70. 8 published by K. Barwick reads: "Romanus autem in libro de analogia VII refert sic."¹ There are no comparable references to numbered books in Charisius's other citations of Julius Romanus,

1. *Flavii Sospatri Charisii artis grammaticae libri V*, addenda et corrigenda collegit et adiecit F. Kühnert (Leipzig, 1964) (= *GL* 1. 56. 4). The reading is presented as part of the suppletion, based on the *excerpta Cauchii* and the text of H. van Putschen, proposed for the lacuna following "in libro de an . . ." in N (= *codex Neapolitanus* IV A 8 [saec. vii/viii]; the lacuna follows "in libro de analogia . . ." in n = *codex Neapolitanus* IV A 10 [saec. xv/xvi]).

nor is there any reason to believe that Romanus's work ran to as many as seven books.² Read rather: "in libro de analogia [(X)VII] refert sic"; and regard the numeral VII of the *excerpta Cauchii* as the remnants of a gloss—XVII—by which a reader reminded himself that the excerpts from Romanus's discussion *de analogia* were contained in the seventeenth chapter of the present book of Charisius.

IOANNIS G. TAIFACOS
Athens, Greece

2. For a recent discussion of Charisius's frequent references to Romanus's work, see A. della Casa, "Giulio Romano nella storia della grammatica latina," in *Varron, grammaire antique et stylistique latine. Recueil offert à J. Collart*, Publications de la Sorbonne: Etudes 14 (Paris, 1978), pp. 220–24.